



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,324	03/25/2004	Jin-Doo Kim	1594.1352	5428

21171 7590 01/30/2007  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

HECKERT, JASON MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/30/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,324	KIM, JIN-DOO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason Heckert	1746	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____                                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/25/2004</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                           |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 12, 20, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "connecting part" is vague and indefinite. It is not clear what said "connecting part" is and how it functions. Please distinctly claim the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 4, 18, and 25-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramsauer. Ramsauer discloses a locking mechanism for a machine casing, or cabinet, having a door 12. Ramsauer does not disclose the machine as being a washing machine, however no patentable weight is given to the limitation of "washing machine" considering the structure disclosed by the applicant is merely a cabinet and door, which Ramsauer fully discloses. The locking mechanism comprises a handle 20 attached to a first hinge unit at 104, a latch attached to a second hinge unit at 22, and an elastic unit 74 that biases said second hinge unit in a locked position. The handle part contains a

Art Unit: 1746

first lever part, the majority of the bar, and a second lever part integrated with the first, the smaller tip 50. The first lever part is wider and longer than the second lever part. The latch contains a third lever part to the left of hinge 22, and a fourth lever part to the right of 22 with a hook 30 that fits in hole 114 in the cabinet. The third and fourth lever parts are integrated and the third is in contact with the second. When the first lever part is pulled, part 50 pushes the third lever part, and the elastic part 74 is compressed allowing the latch to be rotatably released. The latch penetrates a through-hole 120 in the door. The second hinge part comprises support members 46, rotatably supporting a hub with walls 56 and 58. Unit 22 has a shaft. Bearing 54 passes through the shaft and the hub and is supported by walls 56 and 58. The hub acts as the center of rotation for the latch. Members 48 are considered to function as brackets and have holes to allow the bearing to pass through which allow the latch to be mounted. The hook 30, which locks the door, is perpendicular to the fourth lever part, which extends outwardly through through-holes 114 and 120.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-11, 13-19, 22-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostdiek et al. in view of Ramsauer. Ostdiek et al. teaches a washing machine with a transparent part (see Figure 1) mounted to a frame with an open center

Art Unit: 1746

as well as a locking mechanism comprising latch 43 and latch receiving units 46 and 48 in the frame of the cabinet, which is common in the art. It would be obvious to implement any known locking mechanism known at the time of the invention, in the washing machine of Ostdiek et al. Furthermore, rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious. *In re Japikse* 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1955). The locking mechanism of Ramsauer, which contains the structural limitations of claims 1 – 4 as stated above, could be implemented in the machine of Ostdiek et al, so that the door-locking unit is disposed between the transparent part and the frame. In regards to claims 7, 8, and 15, Ramsauer discloses a hinge for the latch assembly comprising parts 46 and 48 which read on support members and brackets as stated above. These parts further read on support projections and seats. The walls 56 and 58 are equivalent to stoppers.

Duplication of parts was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Since Ramsauer already discloses the equivalent structures associated with the second hinge at 22, it would be obvious to include the same structures with the first hinge at 104. In regards to claims 17 and 19, Ramsauer discloses third and fourth lever parts that operate with the first and second lever parts to provide the function of opening the door. In the case of Ramsauer, the second lever part is perpendicular to the first.

Rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious. *In re Japikse* 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1955). It would have been obvious to make the third part perpendicular to the fourth instead of the first part perpendicular to the second, thereby providing the same mechanical action. Noting that the handle part is perpendicular to the latch in the

invention of Ramsauer, just as disclosed by the applicant, it could therefore be implemented so that the third lever part extends from the hub horizontally to the transparent part and the fourth lever part extends perpendicularly to the transparent part through the through-holes when implemented in a washing machine like that of Ostdiek et al. Ramsauer discloses the additional mechanical features of claims 6, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 22-24 as stated above in paragraph 3. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Ostdiek et al., and include the locking mechanism of Ramsauer, to provide a door latch that is readily accessible to the user.

6. Claims 12, 20, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostdiek et al. in view of Ramsauer and further in view of Onderka et al. As stated above, Ramsauer discloses a functionally equivalent locking mechanism including an elastic member that is compressed when the handle is actuated. This elastic member is in the form of a compressible spring, not a wound coil. Wound coils are well known in the art for providing biasing means. Onderka et al. discloses such a coil with legs 56 and 57 disposed about a hub 55 (Figure 10) for providing biasing means to a latch like that disclosed Ramsauer and the applicant. Furthermore, the spring legs are connected to each other by the body of the coil. In regards to the placement of the spring legs, or coil parts, rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious. *In re Japikse* 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1955). Onderka discloses all of the functional parts of the coil, and when implemented in place of the spring on Ramsauer, rearrangement of the legs to fit properly in between the bracket and hub would be obvious. However, independent of this rearrangement, the coil of Onderka is still a functional equivalent to the coil of the

Art Unit: 1746

applicant. Upon the modification in view of Onderka, claim 21 is rejected on the same grounds as claims 17 and 19 as stated above in paragraph 5. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, to modify Ostdiek et al. as stated above and include the locking mechanism of Ramsauer, and further modify Ramsauer and Ostdiek et al. by including a coil, as taught by Onderka, to provide biasing means of which motivation for is taught in both Ramsauer and Onderka.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Heckert whose telephone number is (571) 272-2702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Friday, 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571)272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMH

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Barr", with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

MICHAEL BARR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER